

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

November 18,1992

Jerome E. Dennis, Chief
LightProducts Branch
Division of Standards Enforcement
Office of Compliance and Surveillance
Center for Device and Radiological Health
HFZ-312
1390 Piccard Drive
Rockville, MD 20750

92 AUG 18 AM 9: 34

REFERENCE:

Notice of Consideration of Possible Amendments to the Federal

Performance Standard for Laser Products, J.E. Dennis, FDA, 9/23/92

Mr. Dennis:

Thank you for giving the Laboratory the opportunity to comment on possible amendments to the Federal Performance Standard for Laser Products. The Laboratory has comments on the following two proposals:

Proposal #3

FDA is proposing to lower the maximum emission duration to be considered, for Class 1 lasers that are not intended to be viewed, to 100 seconds. Classification of lasers for which viewing is intended as Class 1 would still require consideration of exposure durations of 10⁴ seconds. For this latter group, a less restrictive criterion is found in the ANSI Z136.1 standard, *i.e.*, "maximum exposure duration resulting from the inherent design or intended use".

Where laser products are intended for viewing, it would normally be relatively easy to define a maximum likely (or even unlikely) exposure duration, and that duration would normally be less than 10⁴ seconds. For this reason, and for consistency between standards, adoption of something similar to the ANSI approach would be recommended.

Proposal #7

FDA is considering changes to the tables in 21 CFR 1040.10(d) for the purpose. of making the resulting classifications agree more nearly with the chand ANSI classifications. It is stated that the present structure of the tables will be maintained if possible because manufacturers are accustomed to it and because it is simpler than the corresponding ANSI and IEC tables.

93N-0044

232314013

Certainly the ANSI calculations are more complex, but if simplification results in some systems being considered more hazardous than they would be under the ANSI or IEC methods, the more complex should be used. The extra engineering cost of making the more complex calculation applies just once to each laser product, while the cost of the required mitigating features for a system that unnecessarily falls into a higher classification applies to each unit sold.

Other proposed amendments in this document seem to be reasonable and acceptable changes. If you have any questions, please contact Scott Hildum, the Laboratory's Laser Safety Officer at (510) 422-5263.

Dennis K. Fisher Associate Director Plant Operations

JSH:DKF:kdd

cc: HS 92-134

George Campbell David Counts Bill Silver Scott Hildum Date file

IMAGE Scanned

232314

•				
XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXXX XXX XXX XXX XXXXXXXX	XXX XXX XXX XXX XXXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	XXX XXX XXX XXXX XXX XXXXXXX XXX XXX	XXXX XXX XXX XXXXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX	XX xxx XXX XX xxx xxx XXXXXXXX XXX 1218 x XXXXX xxx Xxx xx x Xxxx xxx N2G x xxx Xxxxxxxx
CIID T				
COMMENTING ON OF LASER PRODU	POSSIBLE AMEN UCTS.	DMENTS TO FE	EDERAL PERFORM	IANCE STANDARD
CNTL FILE PNTS	LALZ/L1			RECD 12/01/02
232311 11115				12/01/92
INCOMING ROUTE SHEET	T, OFFICE OF C	OMPLIANCE, I	DEVICES AND RA	ADIOLOGICAL HEALTH
ROUTE TO	UNIT INITIAL	S DATE	COMMENTS:	
JERRY DENNIS	LPB			
JOY LAZAROFF	LPB			
			2000	216020
NOTE: UNLESS OTHERW	VISE MARKED TH	JE ATTACHED	FOTOUC	OPY AND NEED NOT
BE RETURNED T ON THIS SHEET,	TO FILE. IF FI THEN RETURN	LE POINT CHA	ANGES ARE NEC	ESSARY NOTE THEM E DMS FILE STAFF.
Xxxxxxx Xxxx	XXXX XXXX	XXXXX XX	XXXXXX XX	X XXXX
XXX XXX	XXX xxx xxx Xxxxx	XXX XXX XXX	XXX XXX XXXXX XXX	x Xxxxxx
XXXX		xxx Xxxx	XXXXX XXX	x xxx xxx x Xxxxxxxxxx
		XXXXXX XX	XXXXXX XXX XXXXX XXX	X XX
		•••	4444	IMÂGE Scanned

